

- (c) establishing a back-up system;
- (d) connecting said client system, said server system, said back-up system;
- (e) under the control of said client system displaying a record form and in response to data entered on said client system, completing data fields and sending said completed record form and to said server system with unique client identifier;
- (f) under the control of said server system receiving said record with said data and said unique client identifier, storing said record in a segregated database keyed to said client identifier;
- (g) under the control of said back-up system receiving said completed record form permanently stored in said server system and making a permanent back-up so that a back-up of said segregated database is made

The Examiner then reasoned that Sandifer discloses write protection and further reasoned that this made the record permanently attached to each record so that it is unalterable. Therefore, without the Good reference, Sandifer fails to teach (a) through (g) as outlined above. Consequently, without the Good reference, Claim 1 is allowable as written.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner also relied on Good, Column 11, Lines 61-67 and Column 12, Lines 1-7, and Lines 29-41 to teach the additional limitations added to Claim 2 for providing automatic warnings of noncompliance with regulations and sending warning to said client system whereby aid is provided in avoiding inadvertent regulatory violations. As with Claim 1, removing Good as a reference by means of the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131, the Sandifer reference alone fails to render obvious Claim 2.

Regarding Claim 8, the Examiner reasons that Good teaches:

- (a) a client system having a display, a keyboard for data entry, a network connection, and software enabling said client computer to connect to said network connection;
- (b) a server computer with a network connection and record keeping software;
- (c) back-up data storage computer having a network connection;
- (d) means for making a record on said client computer and sending said record on said

network connection to said server computer, said record keyed to a unique client identifier;

- (e) means for receiving a client system generated record in said server, storing and organizing said client system generated record with record keeping software in said server computer whereby once a client system generated record is recorded and stored in said server system;
- (f) means for making a back-up copy of said client generated record in said back-up data storage computer.

The Examiner added Sandifer to Good to reason that the Sandifer write protection makes the record permanent and unalterable. Consequently, without the Good reference as prior art, Sandifer alone does not render Claim 8 obvious.

Regarding Claim 9, the Examiner reasons that Claim 9 corresponds to the method in Claim 2 and rejected Claim 9 under the same rationale as Claim 2 was rejected. Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments advanced above regarding the allowability of Claim 2 and will not repeat them here.

Regarding Claims 3, 10, 4-7, and 11-13, the Examiner again relies on the essential teachings of Good in combination with other patents, Sandifer, Chapin Jr., U. S. Patent #5,931,878, and Evans, U.S. Patent #6,347,329. The Applicant notes that the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 establishes a reduction of practice prior to the filing date of Evans of August 1, 2000. Consequently, insofar as Evans is used along with Good to reject Claims 4-7 and 11-13, the Evans reference is no longer prior art as it relates to this application. Regarding each of the above claims without the teaching of the Good patent and/or the Evans patent, the Examiner's grounds for rejection are no longer valid. The Applicant will not repeat in detail arguments related to those rejections and the references but will incorporate by reference herein that the arguments advanced regarding the allowability of Claims 1 and 8. Consequently, it is believed that Claims 3, 10, 4-7, and 11-13 are allowable as written.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected as unpatentable over Good in view of Sandifer and further in view of Evans. Regarding Claim 14, the Examiner reasoned that Good teaches a system comprising:

- (a) a client computer having a display, means for data entry, means for connection to a network, and software, using said means for network connection to a remote server;
- (b) said remote server computer with means for network connection to said client computer, said client computer software, and with record keeping software;
- (c) said record keeping software with means for providing automatic warning of noncompliance with regulation to said client computer;
- (d) said record keeping software in said remote server computer with means for storing records

The Examiner reasoned that Sandifer discloses write protection, which is equivalent to the claimed unalterable records and Sandifer teaches electronic log books in compliance with FAA regulations. The Examiner further reasoned that Evans discloses a medical record system, which contains a database of patient information accessible to users in varying degrees based on a unique client identifier.

The Applicant has filed a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 removing both the Good and Evans patents as references. Consequently, Sandifer standing alone cannot form a grounds for rejecting Claim 14.


Regarding Claims 15, 16, and 17-20, The Examiner adds additional reference to Jiang, U. S. Patent #6,278,913 to the combination of Good, Sandifer, and Evans. However, with Good and Evans removed as references, Claims 15-20 are allowable as written. Applicant incorporates by reference herein arguments made above regarding the failure of the Sandifer or other references, including Jiang and Chapin, U. S. Patent 5,931,878 to teach what is claimed in the above claims.

#### Conclusion

The Applicant has filed a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131, which removes the Good and

Evans patents as prior art references. Without these patents as references, all claims in the application are allowable as written and the same is respectfully requested.

This the 17 day of Feb, 2005.

  
Michael E. Mauney  
Attorney at Law  
Post Office Box 10266  
Southport, NC 28461  
Telephone (910) 457-0056